IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.485 OF 2006

.....

OFFICE NOTES, OFFICE MEMORANDUM OF CORAM, APPEARANCES, COURT'S ORDERS OR DIRECTIONS AND REGISTRAR'S ORDERS	COURT'S OR JUDGES ORDERS

.....

Shri Sanjeev P. Kadam for the Applicant.
Shri M.S.Mohite for the Respondent No.2.
Shri A.S.Shitole, A.P.P. for the State.

CORAM : A. S. OKA, J.
DATE : SEPTEMBER 22, 2006.

P.C.:

1. Heard the Advocates appearing for the parties. Office noting shows that the first Respondent is duly served. The second Respondent is represented by Shri Mohite. Shri Mohite strongly opposed the Application for condonation of delay. He pointed out that all along the Applicant has been represented by a power of attorney holder. He submitted that there is no reason whatsoever for condoning the delay which is of more than a year. I have perused the Application. I have also perused the additional affidavit filed by the Applicant. One of the grounds appears to be that the power of attorney holder of the Applicant

had no authority to apply for withdrawal of the complaint. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I find that sufficient cause is made out for condonation of delay. Accordingly, rule is made absolute in terms of prayer clause (a). Place the Application for leave on board on 13th October, 2006.

JUDGE